



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

IRELAND AND THE VICTORIAN ERA.

You ask me—Why have not the Irish joined in the celebrations of the Queen's Jubilee? I answer that, if the Jubilee were intended to honor the Queen in a personal sense, Ireland had ample reason for her sullen silence. If it were designed to celebrate her government of Ireland for fifty years, holding her responsible, Ireland could not participate in it; for, if responsible, she is, as a sovereign, to Ireland—infamous.

Let the Queen tell her own story of her government of Ireland and expound her own sense of her responsibility for it. It is to be found in the "Life of the Prince Consort," approved and annotated by her. It is clearly shown therein that the Prince, who habitually obeyed the injunction of his friend and mentor, Baron Stockmar, to "be the constitutional genius of the Queen," "qualified himself thoroughly for supporting the sovereign by his advice" by "giving the most assiduous attention to every subject, whether at home or abroad." His diary confirms this and affords copious details in support of it. The standard of duty and prerogative which animated them is defined in a letter from Stockmar to the Prince "containing the expression of a conviction," says the official biographer, with the Queen's sanction, "which it was the study of the Prince's life to realize." Whigs and Tories, writes Stockmar, saw that there was only one thing to keep democracy within bounds:

"This one thing was the upholding and strengthening of the autonomy of the monarchial element, which the fundamental idea of the English constitution had from the first conceded to royalty and indeed concedes to the present hour. . . . In reference to the Crown the secret is simply this: Since 1830 the executive power has been entirely in the hands of the ministry; and these being more the servants of Parliament, particularly the House of Commons, than of the Crown, it is practically in the hands of that House. This is a distortion of the fundamental idea of the British constitution which could not fail to grow by degrees out of the incapacity of her sovereigns rightly to understand and to deal with their positions and out of the encroachments on their privileges by the House of Commons. Still, the right of the Crown to assert itself as permanent head of the

council over the temporary leader of the ministry, and to act as such, is not likely to be gainsaid even by those who regard it through the spectacles of party."

Upon this significant intimation the official biographer declares that "The Prince's reply must have been most welcome, for it gave Baron Stockmar the clearest assurance that the objects of his solicitude had advanced far in securing the very position before the country which he had set his heart upon their maintaining."

The insidious hint of Stockmar,—that it was the incapacity of preceding sovereigns that had made effectual "the encroachments of Parliament upon the power of the crown"—would have cost a head in the sturdy days when those "encroachments" were being effected. The Queen's reprinting of the Stockmar letter and her approval of the comment upon it, is a sufficient refutation of the pleasant apology in her behalf that she did not meddle with government. The truth is that while the Prince lived they devoted their entire time to meddling with government, when not visiting on the continent or absorbed in private pleasure at home. The "Life" shows that they shared the industry of ministers in all diplomatic transactions; that they indicated their own preferences in advance to cabinets upon all matters which aroused their feelings or touched their interests. Concerning Ireland, the diary of the Prince, the letters of the Queen, and the narrative of the "Life" show that they had constant and close contemplation of the condition of that country between 1842 and 1851; and the spirit which both betray toward it is one of stolid prejudice and profound hatred. The gigantic famine which came slowly but with awful distinctness upon the country in 1846, and whose effects were not over in 1850, is minutely chronicled by his hand and hers. The chronicle shows that she was silent when a word from her would have saved the lives of tens of thousands of those she claimed as subjects; that she participated in gay festivities while thousands were being buried, like dogs, coffinless, starved amid plenty; that coercion laws, enacted at every session of Parliament while the famine continued, to "enforce tranquillity" while the slaughter went on all over the land, received her prompt signature, and that she refused to visit the suffering country while the dread visitation was blighting it. She knew that every year, while tens of thousands perished of hunger, food enough was raised by their labor to feed more than twice the entire popula-

tion. Where is her protest against its export ; where is her protest against the tithes collected during those years from the starving and the dying for the support of the church of which she was the head and whose portals the victims never crossed ?

When the famine was over she visited the island for the first and last time, carefully guarded by seven men-of-war. Surrounded by military she gazed upon a country over whose face the great scars must have been as visible as the paths of lava down fertile uplands and over the fair bosom of the volcano-swept landscape. Two million and a half of the people had disappeared ; more human beings had been starved into the grave in three years under her rule than England lost by the sword in all her wars. She had written that in the presence of great events she is unmoved ; “ it is only trifles that irritate me.” In the presence of the greatest disaster that Europe has witnessed, she remained unmoved. During the week of her stay she spoke no word of pity, performed no act of clemency. In the phrase of the great poet she could say

I have given suck and know
How tender 'tis to love the babe that milks me ;

but she was unmoved when Irish mothers gave suck to adult sons that they might be able to stand up in the Relief works and earn a pittance to postpone death for the robbed infants. She was unmoved when frenzied mothers ate the babes that plucked in vain at withered nipples. She was unmoved when crowds of little children could be seen scattered over the ripened fields, or, in winter, like flocks of famishing crows, devouring raw turnips, shivering in snow, half naked, and uttering cries of hunger. She was unmoved when signing bills taking away the last remnant of civil liberty from an entire people whose offense was that landlords carried out of their country the food intended by nature and raised by their own hands for their sustenance, leaving three-fourths of them to feel the pangs of starvation. Desperation had resulted in the attempt at insurrection which filled the jails with victims. It had been represented to the people that if they treated the Queen with civility she would release some of the prisoners. They needed no bribe to be courteous to a woman. But the pledge, whether authorized or not, was unfulfilled.

Forty years have passed. She has been consistent. The traditions of her stock and of the Prince, that men exist to be sold or to be kept as taxpayers, have not been infringed for Ireland, even by caprice or chance. When another famine was threatened in 1880 the precepts and precedents of Albert's days—"those days of untroubled happiness," as she has recently described them—were sacredly maintained. Once more coercion—the clang of the prison door, the rattle of musketry, the suppression of the press, the cowing of the people, men-of-war in the harbors, increased evictions, "enforced tranquillity." Nor has she been recreant to her principles even in her year of Jubilee. The meanest tyrants who occupied the throne of declining Rome might dignify their jubilees by the manumission of slaves, the liberation of captives of war, the breaking of dungeon-locks upon political prisoners. With unflinching hand Victoria has celebrated the fiftieth year of her reign in Ireland by another of Albert's "remedial measures"—a coercion act; and instead of pardoning a prisoner who loved his poor motherland even more than he despises the Queen, she will erect, if necessary, additional jails to inclose, on the slightest pretext, hundreds, including among them, without hesitation, the elected representatives of the people.

Nor can she cloud behind extraordinary intellectual attainments or virile governing faculties her want of attributes essentially womanly. She has incessantly meddled with the State. But she is guiltless of statesmanship. An Elizabeth might be cruel like a man; but she was fearless, capable; she governed like a man. Victoria has never surrendered government to the constitutional agents who did not exist in Elizabeth's time; her interference has been petty, persistent, personal. She has not suggested a statute. She has not modified a legislative proposal. She has not furnished her country or her age with a sentence, a deed, an episode, to lend a glow to a page of her reign. The only claim seriously made for her is that she is a good woman, a good wife and mother. The privilege of denying for their sovereign what good women the world over make no matter of boast—it is happily so common—I leave to English pens. The characterization of the Queen extant among her courtiers it would ill become a man of the Irish race to repeat. Whether as woman or sovereign, that race owes her only execration.

If we consider the history of Ireland apart from the Queen,

and compare it, during the fifty years period, with the history of Great Britain, the result can be indicated by using the plus sign for increase and the minus sign for loss. Thus :

	Great Britain.	Ireland.
Population.....	+	—
Trade.....	+	—
Shipping.....	+	—
Textile industry.....	+	—
Hardware.....	+	—
Mining.....	+	—
Steam power.....	+	—
Wealth.....	+	+
Liberty.....	+	—
Taxation.....	—	+
Poverty.....	—	+

A notable work of the year is Mr. Mulhall's "Fifty Years of National Progress." If we take his percentages and apply them to Ireland under their respective heads, we shall have some striking exhibits of the reason why Ireland abstained from the Jubilee. For instance, he finds that the population of the United Kingdom increased 42 per cent. The decline of Ireland's population is greater than the increase of that of the United Kingdom. Had everything in Ireland declined proportionately, we would have the figures in the first column of the following table instead of those in the second :

TABLE A.—ON BASIS OF DECLINE OF POPULATION.

	What ought to be.	What is.
Wealth.....	£47,643,000	£183,429,000
Taxation.....	2,500,000	7,531,857
Physical force (cost of).....	738,714	4,794,600

If, ignoring the decline in population of Ireland, we apply the percentages of increase under their respective heads for the United Kingdom, we will have the figures in the first column of the following table, instead of those in the second, which are the actual ones :

TABLE B.—ON BASIS OF PROGRESS OF THE UNITED KINGDOM.

	What ought to be.	What is.
Population.....	11,000,000	4,800,000
Wealth.....	£195,336,300	£183,429,000
Shipping (nominal tonnage).....	1,188,588	235,344
Increase of steam tonnage.....	18	4
Textile manufacture (linen).....	£20,000,000	£5,000,000
All other manufactures, textile and mineral.....	?	0

Whence it appears that in everything which constitutes progress Ireland has declined ; and in everything which proves decay Ireland has progressed.

Some of these figures involve peculiar and unique interest ; and I am glad to be able to draw the thoughtful attention of my American fellow citizens to their extraordinary significance.

In the June number of the *NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW* it was shown that under the inspiration of the National movement to recover legislative independence, certain facts were co-incident : That crime of every kind had declined until it is the lowest proportionately in the civilized world ; that school enrollment has become the highest, proportionately, in the world ; and that 85 of 103 constituencies have sent Nationalists to Parliament. That is the sum total of what the people have done for themselves. Now what has the Government done for them in fifty years, in resistance to the National spirit ?

It has reduced the tilth of one of the most fertile countries in Europe to an eighth of the cultivable land ;* and compels the people of England and Scotland to buy food from Russia, India, Canada, and the United States, instead of permitting them to buy a considerable quantity at their own doors. It has diminished by more than half the purchasers of English manufactures a few hours' sail from the factories. This blindness for British interests has been inseparable from a policy of brutality towards Ireland, of which the decay of her tillage and her population are only two great incidents.

A monstrous falsehood, which has been persistently sent forth, is completely refuted by the figures following "Physical force."

*A very recent publication entitled "*The Material Progress of Ireland*," by Prof. Leone Levi, claiming that since there is more land under cultivation in Ireland than there was forty years ago Ireland has been making progress, is misleading, because he fails to point out that in the decline of tillage and the increase of pasture there is a two-fold loss. First, the loss represented by the difference between the food supply produced by land under crops and land under grass,—a proportional difference of five to one ; and secondly, the loss to Ireland in the export of meat almost exclusively on the hoof, the English manufacturer getting the advantage in hide, tallow, etc., at the expense of both the Irish farmer and manufacturer. Prof. Leone Levi also says that emigration has been necessary because, presumptively, Ireland has been overpopulated. This theory never had any substantial support and was long ago exploded. The only arguments ever advanced in its behalf were political, not economic. In proportion to area and capacity for food production and manufactures, Ireland has been and is the most sparsely populated country in Europe.

It has been repeatedly asserted that only a small portion of the people were hostile to the Government ; that the great mass would be loyal if they got the chance. But what do the figures prove ? That when the population was 8,000,000, and the school enrollment was one-sixteenth of it, the country was kept "loyal" by an expenditure of £1,500,000 for military and constabulary ; and that with a population half as large and the school enrollment one-fifth of it, with the great increase of intelligence which that indicates, it requires an expenditure more than six times greater, proportionally, for soldiers and constables to keep the country "loyal." *

If taxes had declined with population, Ireland would be paying £2,500,000 instead of three times that amount, which she actually pays. There is another significant fact under this head. The population fell away between 1847 and 1851 two million and a half on account of famine and excess of poverty. The time had surely come for a reduction of taxation. In 1852, the taxation of England and Scotland was reduced and 52 per cent. was added to the taxation of Ireland.

I will be reminded that more than half the taxes are paid in excise. That is true ; distilling and its related industries are the only manufactures spared by English legislation for Ireland. Inasmuch as every article manufactured in Ireland which could

* In addition to the armed police, England finds it necessary, for the maintenance of Castle government in Ireland against the will of the Irish people, to keep an immense military garrison constantly in occupation of the country. This garrison amounts to an unusually strong expeditionary army. There are hardly ever less than 30,000, and often more than 50,000, English regular troops of all arms—infantry, cavalry, artillery, and engineers—quartered in Ireland. They occupy all the cities, chief towns, and strategic points. Proportionately to population, there are six soldiers in Ireland to every one there is in England.

To maintain this force in Ireland, England's standing army is put to a severe strain. This force is composed of the cream of the English levies—leaving out the Irish regiments, undoubtedly the best in the army, which are always carefully sent on foreign service whenever the Irish situation is thought "critical." For the purpose of the late war in Egypt Sir Garnet Wolseley was sorely pressed to scrape together an efficient expeditionary force ; volunteers had to be asked for from the reserves to bring the war regiments up to their full campaigning strength ; and, in the end, after reducing the regiments of the home linked battalions to skeletons, Wolseley's force was largely made up of raw boys, who dropped like flies under the climate of Egypt. Yet, at that moment, there were 50,000 troops, the flower of the English army—twice as big a force as would have sufficed Wolseley, for these were real soldiers—under arms in Ireland ; and of these England was afraid to stir a single man !—*Castle Government*, by T. P. Gill, M. P.

be manufactured in England was by law prohibited in Ireland and destroyed, the inference is justified that Ireland was permitted to continue making whisky because England could not make it as well to her satisfaction; while, at the same time, by keeping intoxicating drink cheap in Ireland, the latter would be rendered less able to cast off the yoke of her oppressor.

Customs, in spite of the alleged free trade of the United Kingdom, pay one-fourth of the Irish taxes, stamps pay one-thirteenth, and the income tax one-tenth. Only a small portion of the total goes back to the people for their good. Physical force to keep them "loyal" consumes half the entire expenditure. A fifth goes to the National debt of Great Britain, in express violation of the Act of Union, by which it was declared that Ireland should not be held responsible for the debt of the empire prior to that act. An army of tax-eaters hostile to the tax-payers consumes a considerable sum; and after all this is done, a balance remains to be sent over annually to the English exchequer. In proportion to population and benefit to the tax-payers, Ireland is the most heavily taxed country on the globe.

The financial history of Ireland during the reign of the present sovereign would be incredible if it could not be demonstrated. While the population has diminished, the cultivation of the soil has declined, and manufactures have failed to recover from the effects of prohibitory laws followed by the fixed domination of English interests in the Irish railways and markets, the banking power of Ireland has shown no decline. Forty years ago, when the population was about 8,000,000, the deposits in the joint stock banks of Ireland were £8,031,044. In 1885, with a population a little below 5,000,000, they were £29,240,000. The increase is not sevenfold, as it is in the United Kingdom; but it is far more than sevenfold when we remember that the population and all the manufacturing industries in England and Scotland have also increased with the increase of the banking power.

The increase of the wealth of Ireland, as exhibited under this head alone, is complete proof of systematic misgovernment. The increase of wealth, as in England and Scotland, as Mr. Mulhall shows, is a diffused increase; more people have money, and the comforts it produces, in proportion to population in England and Scotland, than fifty years ago. In Ireland the rich have grown richer; the many have died of famine, or have been

driven into exile ; those who have remained at home have been kept in poverty for the enrichment of the few.

The complete impoverishment of the mass of the people and their subjection to the money power is shown from the bank statistics in still another way. In 1845 the certified issue of all the banks in Ireland was £6,354,000. In 1885 it was £6,052,516. It has never varied much from these figures during the entire interval, except following the famine of 1847, when it declined to about one-half for a short time. This uniformity in circulation, while deposits have increased and capital remained the same, discloses the absolute monopoly of the business of Ireland in the hands of the wealthy few. They need no more money in circulation now than they needed forty years ago. The bank stock, meanwhile, in a country without manufactures, with declining agriculture and diminished population, has always been excessively profitable. For many years in succession the Irish banks have paid their shareholders dividends of 20 per cent. per annum. They pay their own depositors 2 per cent. They loan in London at from 4 to 10. Meanwhile, the country which produces the deposits goes to ruin, so far as the mass of the people are concerned ; and the wealth which is the result of their labor upon the soil,—for nine-tenths of the joint stock bank deposits represent only agriculture,—instead of being used in Ireland for their benefit, is drained out to enrich their oppressors and perpetuate the monopoly of the Irish market for the British manufacturers. The *Bankers' Magazine*, commenting on the deposits for 1886, remarks that they belong for the most part to persons “resident in England, whence their funds are naturally remitted.” That is a roundabout way of describing the absentee landlords and their creditors. It is a very candid way of admitting that the wealth produced by Irish labor out of Irish soil is not spent in Ireland.

A glance at the increase and decrease of deposits during the reign will show how complete is the separation of the moneyed minority,—the landlords,—who do nothing to make money, from the people, whose labor is the sole money-maker. From 1843 to 1846 inclusive, the deposits increased 9 per cent. In 1847 there was a fall of 23 per cent. But in 1848, 1849, and 1850 there was an increase of more than 9 per cent., while the charity of the world was sending money into Ireland to stop the extermination

of the people by famine. That increase represents in part better crops, but also in large part the remittances sent from America and elsewhere, nearly every dollar of which found its way into the landlords' pockets. From 1852 to 1856 the deposits increased 13 per cent., while population continued to diminish; in 1857 there was a very slight decline, owing to the universal financial panic; but the landlords' crops and serfs pulled them up again promptly.

In 1879, when the cry of famine again startled the humane world, and the machinery of charity was set in operation, the deposits were £30,191,000. The effect of charity money sent in was apparent in the increase of deposits in 1882 and the next year, again confirming the statement that the bulk of money sent to friends and relatives in Ireland for charity goes to the landlords. In spite of a diminution of population from 11,000,000 to less than 5,000,000; in spite of diminished tillage and the continued paralysis of manufactures, the landlords' income has grown five-fold during the reign of Victoria.

This money is the natural capital of Ireland. It does not represent, speaking broadly, a cent of original investment by the landlords who have exclusive enjoyment of it. No error could be greater than to presume that the agriculture of England and of Ireland has been conducted upon identical principles. In England, at least in our own day, the landlord's capital is applied to the estate, and if the tenant adds out of his capital to its value, he gets the benefit of his enterprise in rebate of rent. In Ireland the reverse has been true. The improvements constituting value have been generally and uniformly made by the tenant; and instead of being allowed a reduction in rent in consequence, the rental has increased, as the bank deposits show, in proportion to the increase of value effected by the tenants. When, therefore, critics of Mr. Gladstone complain of his land legislation for Ireland being exceptionally favorable, they ignore the exceptional injustice which made that legislation compulsory.

But instead of investing this labor-and-land-made capital in the country which produces it, the landlords, through their agents, the Irish banks, send it over to England. Two of the banks have head offices there; the others employ London bankers as agents for them. "So that," remarks an official commentator, "a large portion of this Irish capital"—at least \$150,000,000

—“is really circulating in the great money market of the world, London.”

No country having only one industry, and that the production of food, ever prospered, or ever can prosper. Until this Irish capital is invested in manufactures in Ireland, no hope need be indulged that the industrial paralysis of the country is to be disturbed.

The subject of manufactures in Ireland is one which it would be folly to undertake to discuss within the limits of this article. Under the self-respecting stimulus of the National agitation, a spurt of activity, in a small way, has been effected; and among the masses of the people, it has become fashionable to wear and use Irish manufactures. But sentiment is not capital. The natural manufactures of Ireland were destroyed by English statutes. The best account of them is given by Professor Thompson in “University Lectures.”* Ireland has been, since the abolition of the Irish Parliament in 1800, as truly the property of the English manufacturer as the Parliamentary borough and its nominal representative were the property of the landlord prior to legislative reform. Ireland exports only food; she imports only English manufactures. The colonies of Great Britain have profited by Ireland’s ruin. Each of them has not only its domestic government, with which the British Parliament cannot interfere, but they have, one and all, a protective tariff to keep English manufactures out while they build up their own. Ireland has not asked a protective tariff as an indispensable part of Home Rule. She does ask for Home Rule with power enough to induce the investment of Irish capital in Ireland.

If we compare the savings banks of Ireland with the savings banks of the United Kingdom, we find another reason why Ireland could not participate in the Jubilee. These accumulations have grown fourteen times faster than population in the United Kingdom, and population has grown 42 per cent. Since population has declined much more rapidly in Ireland than it has increased in the two sister countries, it would be reasonable to look for a decline of savings, provided the source of them were the same. But the source is not the same. The savings of England and Scotland are derived chiefly from the wage-workers, whose

* “Protection.” Four Lectures delivered in Harvard University. By Rev. Robert Ellis Thompson. 1886.

earnings have risen 20 per cent. or more during the reign, while the prices of necessaries have declined. In Ireland the wage-earning class, aside from poorly-paid agricultural and domestic labor, is inconsiderable, owing to the dearth of manufactures. The savings are chiefly the profits of the small shop-keepers who buy English manufactures and sell them to Irish consumers. These savings, therefore, small as they are, are a dubious proof of Irish prosperity. An anti-National economist boasted, as an evidence of Ireland's happiness under the legislative union with England, that even in 1847 she exported food. Five hundred thousand of the people who had grown the food perished of hunger that year.

In 1835 the number of depositors in the Irish savings banks was 58,482, and the total of their deposits £1,608,653. In 1867 the number of depositors was 53,006, and the total of the deposits £1,633,015. The population meanwhile had declined from 8,000,000 to 5,486,509. In that year the savings in England were £1 9s. 1d. per head of population; in Ireland 5s. 10d. per head. In the post-office savings banks in England there was in the same year one depositor for every eleven persons; in Ireland one depositor for every sixty-nine persons. In 1885 the whole number of depositors in both postal and trustee savings banks in Ireland was 186,013, and the total of their deposits £4,113,387, which may be looked upon as Irish capital employed for the promotion of English industry. The total deposits, therefore, have increased threefold and the number of the depositors about the same, showing that while everything tending to indicate National growth has declined, this item tending to show National prostration has augmented.

The fisheries are an indisputable illustration of the apparent hopelessness of Irish industry while the country is governed in the interest of foreigners.

In 1836 the number of boats engaged in them was 10,761, and the number of men and boys 54,119. In 1885 the number of boats was 5,667, and the number of men and boys 21,491. At the same time many Scotch vessels are engaged in the Irish fisheries, and the imports of fish into a land of fish without fishers amount to nearly 70,000 cwt. at the principal Irish ports.

The charge is commonly made that in dealing with the grievances of Ireland her friends are addicted to denunciation. The

facts I have presented are submitted not only without denunciation, but without argument.

I beg to ask a question : Why have Englishmen celebrated the Queen's jubilee ? Is it to supply history with a gigantic absurdity ? For is it not true that every idea carried into Great Britain by the stock whence she sprang has received its deathblow by the changes effected during her reign ? Is it not true that every political step of the past fifty years has been progress away from monarchy and aristocracy ? Is it not true that this great change, brought about in part by the leveling up of the people through more widely diffused education, and in part by the curtailment of hereditary privilege through the lowering of the franchise, has been forced along constitutionally, in defiance of the dearest principles of the ancestors of the sovereign, and would have been stolidly resisted by her, as other steps forward were by them, if she possessed any genius for reigning ? Is it not true that, instead of being in any degree due to her influence, even negatively, this progress of fifty years is the retroaction of the revolted American colonies upon England ? Is it not true that England has seen each of her foreign dependencies discarding the constitutional model she still retains, seriously modified within fifty years, and adopting instead of it the model of the American Republic ? The English people may justly celebrate their fifty years of political, commercial, and moral growth ; but to celebrate it in association with the name, the antecedents, or the character of Queen Victoria will be smiled upon by history as a great national jest.

They would have still more substantial reason for their Jubilee if Ireland could have consistently joined in it. Deeply respecting their devotion to constitutional liberty,—for themselves,—and sympathising with all that is humane, noble, and just in their progress, I rejoice that the chief barrier which has kept them from beholding Ireland in truth is rapidly losing its strength. The destiny of the London *Times* has been to prolong hatred between England and Ireland. For the fulfillment of that it has continually commanded the newest resources of science and the best purchasable intellect. Every proposal calculated to lighten upon Ireland the cruel burden of the past ; every legislative enactment whose effect would have been to bring the people of the two countries face to face so that they might see their common humanity, it has resisted with vicious energy, and conscienceless

skill. Its favor has been unstinted to every brutal reactionary, every fiendish bigot, every exasperating act of tyranny, aiming at perpetuity of oppression.

At last its power is waning. Its name is no longer feared ; it never was respected. When contemporaries were few and feeble, and news gathering constituted its monopoly, its editorial opinion could be delivered with an impressiveness and effect due largely to a lack of competition. Isolated eminence and resounding noise won for it the name of *The Thunderer*. The epithet has long been obsolete. Influence derived from persistent injustice urged with violent indecency is not proof against the spread of God-like love over the world and the penetration of the dullest human intelligence by the gentle but resistless light of liberty. The habits and manners it has to-day it had in O'Connell's days, when to break him down it vied with the harridans of London fish lanes in vulgarity. The malevolence of its attitude toward mankind secured for it half a century ago the name of the Devil's organ from the Quaker statesman. Robbed of its legitimate renown by younger and more alert rivals, it is reduced to theatrical devices to keep up the appearance of being formidable. If it can no longer forge thunderbolts, it can forge letters. If it can no longer play Vulcan, it can still be

as foul

As Vulcan's stithy.

If it can no longer whip out of public life Irishmen who will not betray their country for office or gold, it can pay handsomely for slander on Irishmen in America by knaves without credit in any American newspaper office. During our civil war its profligate instincts cheated the British public to the last moment with falsehoods about actual events ; and the English generation still living knows that it received with amazement the news of the surrender of Lee, because up to the hour Richmond fell the London *Times* had deliberately suppressed the truth about the results of great battles. It was as solicitous to prevent a reconciliation of the North and South and as anxious to see the Republic fall as it has been greedy and tenacious in feeding fat the hatred between England and Ireland. It reached the climax of brutality when, the morning after the defeat of the Home Rule bill, it told the greatest of the sons of England to gather his old bones

about him and hurry into his grave. If all the signs of the time are not misleading, the grave will wait for Gladstone until the triumph of Home Rule shall furnish for the monument Great Britain and Ireland will rear to him its most glorious line.

ALEXANDER SULLIVAN.